

Policy Recommendations and Performance Indicators

Over 10 months, the taskforce met monthly to hear presentations from experts and received community input as a basis for developing recommendations for each of the primary policy areas: housing and homelessness; social safety net; early childhood; coordinated services, education, workforce, and training; and special populations (juvenile justice and foster care). Subcommittees in each policy area generated language for specific recommendations, and identified the target population, existing research evidence, and approximate cost. The subcommittees solicited feedback from experts, policymakers, and community-based organizations in the field before presenting the recommendations to the full taskforce.

The taskforce identified priority recommendations as those that will (1) directly affect deep child poverty or (2) have a foundational impact on disrupting the cycle of poverty. The recommendations also considered the evidence base, including innovative programs that have shown substantial promise even if they lack rigorous evaluation. A comprehensive approach to reducing deep child poverty must include change within each policy domain, as displayed in Exhibit 13, though the cost and contribution of each area may differ. With the central target of reducing deep child poverty, recommendations that may have the most direct effect on deep child poverty and can be achieved in a relative short time frame are considered recommendations for “immediate impact.” In the outer concentric circle, recommendations for “foundational change” surround and support the immediate impact recommendations, with the goal of disrupting intergenerational cycles of poverty.

Exhibit 13. Targeting reduction of deep child poverty



Recommendations for immediate impacts on deep poverty and breaking the cycle of poverty

In this section, the recommendations from each policy domain are presented. Each recommendation has information about the target population, estimated cost, and rationale and research evidence for the approach. Under the priority recommendations, labeled as “immediate” or “foundational,” the non-priority recommendations are listed to provide a comprehensive set of policy and/or program changes in a given policy domain (and are labeled as “comprehensive”).

Housing and homelessness

Housing is a cross-cutting concern for Californians in poverty, affecting their access to and decisions about healthcare, education, child care, employment and training, and other services. The state is facing a major housing shortage and the majority of California renters spend 30 percent or more of their income on housing.¹ Low-wage workers, families with children, and youth transitioning out of foster care are among the populations most severely impacted by high rents in California.² When rent becomes unaffordable, eviction and the loss of housing poses a wide range of short- and long-term risks and consequences for families, including homelessness, education disruptions, and poor health. Securing decent housing can be more challenging for a family following an eviction judgement.³

Over the past eight years California has dedicated substantial efforts and resources toward mitigating housing insecurity and homelessness for Californians in poverty, and deep poverty. Many departments and specific programs are engaged in addressing the housing requirements of Californians in need and ensuring every California family has a roof over their head. Some of these investments focus specifically on homelessness, while others focus more broadly on the availability and affordability of housing, while assisting homeless Californians as well. Appendix C includes additional details on these investments.

In creating the recommendations in Exhibit 10, the Task Force subcommittee on Housing and Homelessness considered subsidized affordable housing, inclusionary zoning policy, housing vouchers, rent control, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), and policies to address homelessness. The priority recommendations span discrimination protections, targeted rent subsidies, and broader rent control and housing supply provisions to help Californians in poverty secure and maintain decent, affordable housing. The research base for these recommendations varies. Several recommendations are supported by rigorous experimental or quasi-experimental studies, while others involve expansion of pilot programs with research underway. For instance, flexible housing subsidy programs (which can include rent subsidies, supportive services, and landlord assistance) are being piloted in many localities across the country.⁴ Initial reviews of these programs indicate that they have demonstrated notable successes among participants in terms of (1) providing vulnerable populations with improved access to suitable housing, (2) reducing rent burdens and (3) increasing housing stability for the targeted populations.

¹ California's High Housing Costs: Causes and Consequences." California Legislative Analyst's Office, March 2015. <https://lao.ca.gov/reports/2015/finance/housing-costs/housing-costs.pdf>; US Census Bureau, 2016 American Community Survey One-Year Estimates, Table B25074.

² "Opening the Door For Rent Control: Toward a Comprehensive Approach to Protecting California Renters." Nicole Montojo, Stephen Barton, and Eli Moore, Hass Institute, 2018.

³ M. Desmond, "Eviction and the Reproduction of Urban Poverty," *American Journal of Sociology* 118 (2012): 88–133.

⁴ HPRI Literature Review, Flexible Housing Subsidy Pilot Programs. Homelessness Policy Research Institute, October 2018.

Exhibit 14. Housing and homelessness recommendations

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
1. Prohibiting Section 8 discrimination	Immediate	Individuals and families in poverty, deep poverty, and those at risk of poverty.	Administrative and enforcement costs
<p>Description: Further define "source of income" in the state's list of tenant characteristics (such as disability and family status) that are protected from discrimination to include/define HUD Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) or other rental assistance programs as income, to protect Section 8 clients and clients of other rental assistance programs.</p> <p>Evidence: Descriptive evidence shows HCV voucher holders are less successful in finding housing in tighter housing markets⁵, and anecdotal evidence suggests racial disparities among those experiencing homelessness and housing instability, as well as housing discrimination.⁶</p>			
2. Fund shallow rental subsidies	Immediate	Families with children in deep poverty.	\$1.8 billion, assuming subsidy of \$500 per month to cover about 270,000 families in deep poverty.
<p>Description: Fund shallow rental subsidies (flat dollar subsidies based on unit size) for families with children in deep poverty (using the California Poverty Measure). Subsidies could be time-limited or ongoing.</p> <p>Evidence: For families with children, direct rental assistance may be more cost-efficient and less disruptive to children than short shelter stays.⁷ Shallow rent subsidies are used in a number of areas, including Oregon, Minnesota, Illinois, and the District of Columbia to keep families who are in their current housing, and communities find that the costs of providing short-term subsidies are lower than the cost of providing shelter.⁸ The Bringing Families Home (BFH) pilot in Contra Costa County includes shallow rental subsidies, in addition to section 8 vouchers and permanent housing units.⁹ CDSS is working with UC-Berkeley and the Children's Data Network to do an evaluation of BFH - results will be coming in the next 18 months.</p>			
3. Implement rent control and housing supply provisions	Immediate	Provisions would apply to varying degrees to most families, but primary focus would be on families in poverty, deep poverty, or at risk of poverty.	Administrative and support costs.
<p>Description: Impose both (1) state rent stabilization and (2) a set of housing supply provisions in localities falling short of their low-income housing goals and/or experiencing rent increases in excess of inflation. Rent control would apply to non-luxury rental units built more than 12 years prior (if Proposition 10 fails, it would apply only to pre-1995 units). Would not apply to vacant units, and would include provisions prohibiting eviction without just-cause. Housing supply provisions would require that the locality reduce zoning and regulatory requirements on low income housing, particularly in infill and transit-adjacent areas and on public lands, and, for the localities covered by this proposal, would modify existing provisions in state law relating to density bonuses, with the goal of encouraging more set-asides for affordable housing.</p>			

⁵ Meryl Finkel and Larry Buron, "Study on Section 8 Voucher Success Rates," U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2001, https://www.huduser.gov/portal/publications/pdf/sec8success_1.pdf.

⁶ "Minutes for the Housing Authority of the City of Richmond," Richmond Housing Authority, September 29, 2017, <https://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/8346>.

⁷ Dennis P. Culhane & Stephen Metraux (2008) Rearranging the Deck Chairs or Reallocating the Lifeboats? Homelessness Assistance and Its Alternatives, Journal of the American Planning Association, 74:1, 111-121, DOI: 10.1080/01944360701821618. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01944360701821618>

⁸ Collins, C. C., Coulton, C. J., & Kim, S. J. Family Homelessness in Cuyahoga County. http://blog.case.edu/msass/2009/07/07/SoC%205_12_2009_Family_Homelessness%20White%20Paper_FINAL.pdf

⁹ <http://mackcenter.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/hou-2016-05-06/HOU/TOC-HOU-8.pdf>

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
Evidence: Research on San Francisco rent control policies shows that tenants in rent controlled units, particularly elderly renters and families who have been at the address for a long time, are more likely to remain at the same address with rent control. ¹⁰ However, landlords affected by rent control may also reduce rental housing supply. A 2015 study by the California Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) found that California faces a major housing shortage with major impacts on low income Californians. ¹¹ The LAO recommended actions to facilitate construction of high-density housing, such as changes to local land use authority, local finance, and CEQA reform, particularly in regions where housing shortages are most acute. Estimates of effects of specific housing supply policies are provided in an analysis by U.C. Berkeley. ¹²			
4. Incentivize landlords to rent to homeless and low-income families	Comprehensive	Primarily children and families in deep poverty.	\$15 million annually.
Description: Provide funding for counties to offer incentives to landlords who agree to rent to a homeless/poor family with an ongoing or time-limited rental subsidy. Evidence: Los Angeles County has had very good success with a similar program for homeless families/adults seeking permanent supportive housing with a federal rental subsidy. [CITATION]			
5. Expand Bringing Families Home program statewide	Comprehensive	Primarily children and families in deep poverty.	Low tens of millions per year
Description: Bringing Families Home is currently a pilot program in 12 counties which aims to assist child welfare involved families who are homeless find and maintain safe, stable housing through rapid rehousing (rental subsidy plus intensive case management), HUD vouchers, or permanent supportive housing. Evidence: CDSS is working with UC-Berkeley and the Children's Data Network to do an evaluation of BFH - results will be coming in the next 18 months. ¹³			
6. Provide housing subsidies for homeless families and youth	Comprehensive	Children and families in deep poverty.	\$36 million annually. Assumes 2,000 families receive \$1,000 rental subsidy and \$450 in support services per month. (Total also includes administrative costs).
Description: Provide ongoing housing subsidies and services for families and youth experiencing homelessness to access private-market housing or affordable housing to end homelessness among this population. Approach could be considered for youth exiting the juvenile justice system who are at risk of homelessness upon reentry.			

¹⁰ Diamond, R., McQuade, T., & Qian, F. (2018). The effects of rent control expansion on tenants, landlords, and inequality: Evidence from San Francisco (No. w24181). National Bureau of Economic Research.

https://www.nber.org/papers/w24181?utm_campaign=ntw&utm_medium=email&utm_source=ntw

¹¹ California's High Housing Costs: Causes and Consequences." California Legislative Analyst's Office, March 2015. <https://lao.ca.gov/reports/2015/finance/housing-costs/housing-costs.pdf>

¹² MacDonald, G. (2016). The Effect of Local Government Policies on Housing Supply. Turner Center for Housing Innovation at UC Berkeley. http://turnercenter.berkeley.edu/uploads/The_Effect_of_Local_Government_Policies_on_Housing_Supply.pdf

¹³ <https://mackcenter.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/hou-2016-05-06/HOU/TOC-HOU-8.pdf>, https://www.huduser.gov/portal/family_options_study.html, <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/opre/research/project/homeless-families-research-briefs/particularly-child-separation-among-families-experiencing-homelessness-brief>, <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/41621/2000105-Helping-Families-Involved-in-the-Child-Welfare-System-Achieve-Housing-Stability.pdf>, <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/supportive-housing-high-need-families-child-welfare-system/view/full-report>; https://www.csh.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Report_KFTFindingsreport.pdf

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
Evidence: The HUD Family Options Study shows that families getting ongoing rental assistance are far more likely to exit homelessness and remain stably housed than rapid re-housing, shelter, or transitional housing programs. ¹⁴			
7. Provide eviction defense	Comprehensive	Children and families in poverty and deep poverty, or at risk of being in poverty.	High tens of millions of dollars annually.
Description: Provide state funding to support eviction court representation for low-income Californians facing eviction. Evidence: Experimental studies show that tenants with attorneys were less likely to be evicted than self-represented tenants. ¹⁵ An ordinance providing funds to support legal representation in eviction court was passed in San Francisco in 2018.			
8. Provide housing vouchers for transition age youth in foster care	Comprehensive	Primarily young adults in poverty and deep poverty, but potentially small number not in poverty.	\$12 million first year rising to \$48 million by fourth year and hold steady thereafter.
Description: Provide housing vouchers until their 26th birthday for young adults aging out of extended foster care. Evidence: Youth aging out of foster care are among the population at greatest risk for becoming homeless. In a descriptive study of foster care youth up to age 26, nearly one third of study participants experienced homelessness after leaving foster care. ¹⁶ While youth up to age 24 aging out of foster care are able to receive time-limited housing vouchers (up to 18 months) under HUD's Family Unification Program, there is not available evidence of the take up or impact of this program.			

Social safety net

Numerous state and federal programs provide cash assistance and other supports for clothing, food, housing, and other basic needs to lift families out of poverty. Some safety net programs are designed to help families access affordable healthcare and support their employment. California has made considerable progress in this area over the past several years including increased investments in CalWORKS, establishing the CalEITC, and increasing the minimum wage. Appendix C includes additional details on these investments.

The Social Safety Net subcommittee considered multiple policies and programs in designing the recommendations in Exhibit 11: Medi-Cal, CalFresh, CalWORKs, Social Security, SSI, SSP, SSDI (Disability), SDI, SNAP, WIC, EITC, and other proposals or approaches for income support or child support. The priority recommendations presented below focus on putting more dollars in the hands of families in poverty: expanding CalEITC, establishing a state Child Tax Credit, and increasing CalWORKs grants. The evidence supporting these recommendations indicates that increasing family resources has positive effects on children, however many of the specific policy changes have not yet been tested.

¹⁴ Gubits, Daniel, Marybeth Shinn, Michelle Wood, Stephen Bell, Samuel Dastrup, Claudia D. Solari, Scott R. Brown, Debi McInnis, Tom McCall, and Utsav Kattel. "Family options study: 3-year impacts of housing and services interventions for homeless families." (2016). https://www.huduser.gov/portal/family_options_study.html

¹⁵ C. Seron, G. Van Ryzin, M. Frankel, and J. Kovath, "The Impact of Legal Counsel Outcomes for Poor Tenants in New York City's Housing Court: Results of a Randomized Experiment," Law and Society Review 35 (2001): 419–434; D. J. Greiner, C. W. Pattanayak, and J. Hennessy, "The Limits of Unbundled Legal Assistance: A Randomized Study in a Massachusetts District Court and Prospects for the Future," Harvard Law Review 126 (2013): 901–989.

¹⁶ Dworsky, A., Napolitano, L., & Courtney, M. (2013). Homelessness during the transition from foster care to adulthood. American Journal of Public Health, 103(S2), S318–S323. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3969135/>

Exhibit 15. Social safety net recommendations

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
1. Expand CalEITC amount and population	Immediate	Primarily families in poverty and deep poverty.	Raise low-earners to full credit: \$200 million; double credit: \$600 million; extend phase out; from high tens of millions to hundreds of millions, depending how the phase out is structured.
<p>Description: Expand the CalEITC amount and the CalEITC eligible population</p> <p>Evidence: The EITC may help reduce family poverty by as much as one-tenth and childhood poverty by as much as one-fourth among families who receive it.¹⁷ However, current estimates may be underestimated by up to 50 percent because they fail to account for the induced earnings effects. Accounting for the fact that the EITC nudges single mothers to increase their work activity, a \$1000 increase in the EITC is estimated to reduce the share of families living in poverty (after tax and transfer) by about 8 percentage points.¹⁸</p>			
2. Establish a State Child Tax Credit	Immediate	Families in poverty and deep poverty.	\$3.6 billion annually if applied to children 0-17; \$1.2 billion if limited to children 0-5; \$240 million if limited to children under 1 year
<p>Description: Supplement the Federal Child Tax Credit with a State Child Tax Credit and make \$2,000 of the credit fully refundable. The policy would reach families who are not eligible for the full amount of the federal credit and it may serve as an additional incentive to file taxes, which would increase EITC uptake and further reduce poverty.</p> <p>Evidence: Under current law, many children under the age of 17 live in families without enough earnings to qualify for the full child tax credit.¹⁹ Research strongly indicates that even relatively modest increases in family income, particularly for children in the poorest families, can lead to better outcomes in health and education and can have lasting positive effects on economic mobility and opportunity.²⁰</p>			
3. Increase CalWORKs grants	Immediate	Primary impact on families in deep poverty.	\$2.6 billion annually relative to current grant levels. (Effect relative to intent language in AB 1811 would mainly be an acceleration of grant increases.)
<p>Description: Increase CalWORKs grants and expedite the timeline for ending deep poverty within CalWORKs. Currently, CalWORKs grant levels are below the threshold for deep child poverty (50% of the federal poverty level (FPL)). Increasing the grant amount for all CalWORKs families and moving up the three-year timeline to increase grant amounts to 50% of the FPL would help alleviate deep child poverty in the state.</p> <p>Evidence: Researchers found the growth in the number of families living in extreme poverty took place among the groups most affected by welfare reform. As fewer families received TANF, the number of families living in deep poverty rose.²¹</p>			
4. Align CalWORKs limits with federal limits	Comprehensive	Children and families in deep poverty.	\$100 million annually
<p>Description: Align CalWORKs time limits with the federal 60-month time limit. Currently, California imposes a 48 month time limit on CalWORKs assistance.</p>			

¹⁷ Holt, Steve. (2006). The Earned Income Tax Credit at Age 30: What We Know. Washington DC: The Brookings Institution. Retrieved from https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/20060209_Holt.pdf on April 24, 2018.

¹⁸ Hoynes, Hilary, and Ankur Patel. (Forthcoming.) Effective Policy for Reducing Inequality? The Earned Income Tax Credit and the Distribution of Income. Journal of Human Resources.

¹⁹ Greenstein, R., Maag, E., Huang, C. C., Horton, E., & Cho, C. (2018). Improving the Child Tax Credit for Very Low-Income Families. https://www.cbpp.org/sites/default/files/atoms/files/urban_ctc_paper.pdf

²⁰ Kerris Cooper and Kitty Stewart, Does Money Affect Children's Outcomes? A Systematic Review (York, GB: JosephRowntree Foundation, 2013).

²¹ Shaefer, H. Luke, and Kathryn Edin. (2012). Extreme Poverty in the United States, 1996 to 2011. National Poverty Center Policy Brief #28, February 2012, retrieved from http://npc.umich.edu/publications/policy_briefs/brief28/policybrief28.pdf.

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
Evidence: Shorter time limits mean that sometimes families cannot access assistance when they need it most (in a crisis) because they already used up the total time allowed for program participation. ²²			
5. Fund summer lunch program and develop EBT pilot	Comprehensive	Children and families in deep poverty.	Depends on size of pilot: \$120 per child per summer.
Description: Fund summer lunch in libraries and develop an Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) pilot to distribute a monthly benefit during the summer on SNAP or WIC EBT cards to children eligible for free or reduced-price school meals.			
Evidence: Children who receive free or reduced-price lunch during the school year have higher food insufficiency rates in the summer. ²³ Providing summer nutrition programs can greatly reduce the number of children who are food insecure. ²⁴			
6. Provide universal school food programs	Comprehensive	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty, though could benefit others without regard to poverty status.	Low tens of millions to over \$1 billion, depending on reach of program.
Description: Build on a state/federal program already in place, the community eligibility provision, which schools dispense with applications for free-reduced meals and instead cover all students in schools based on an approved federal reimbursement formula. Currently CA implements in high poverty schools where the costs are largely covered by federal funds/ This proposal would expand this to more schools.			
Evidence: [Need more evidence] Approaches such as community eligibility aim to increase access to school meals for low-income children. In Illinois, Kentucky, and Michigan, schools that participated in community eligibility for two years increased average daily participation in the National School Lunch Program by 13 percent and average daily participation in the School Breakfast Program by 25 percent. ²⁵			
7. Increase SNAP benefit	Comprehensive	Primarily children and families in deep poverty.	\$731 million if increase is \$30/month per child; \$342 million if \$30/month per family.
Description: Increase the SNAP benefit amount for families with children age 0-5 and pregnant women. SNAP benefits often run out before the end of the month, which can leave families with limited access to nutritious foods.			
Evidence: Research has revealed that SNAP has a profound impact on children's health and well-being throughout their lifespan. ²⁶			
8. Prevent SNAP sanctions	Comprehensive	Primarily children and families in deep poverty.	Total costs of \$6 million annually. Most expenditures likely from federal funds but potential for moderate state costs in initial years.
Description: Prevent SNAP sanctions for families with children 0-5 and pregnant women. Currently, CalFresh (California's SNAP program) imposes concurrent sanctions when a family fails to comply with the Welfare-to-Work (WTW) requirements for CalWORKs, causing families to lose their CalWORKs and CalFresh benefits simultaneously.			

²² Floyd, I., L. Pavetti, and L. Schott. (2017). TANF Reaching Few Poor Families. Retrieved from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/family-income-support/tanf-reaching-few-poor-families>.

²³ Huang, J., Barnidge, E., & Kim, Y. (2015). Children Receiving Free or Reduced-Price School Lunch Have Higher Food Insufficiency Rates in Summer, 2. The Journal of nutrition, 145(9), 2161-2168.

²⁴ Orovecz, K., Pincus, E., Todd, N., and Welch, M. Summer nutrition program social impact analysis. Deloitte. <http://bestpractices.nokidhungry.org/sites/default/files/download-resource/Summer%20Nutrition%20Program%20Social%20Impact%20Analysis.pdf>

²⁵ Center on Budget and Policy Priorities & Food Research and Action Center, Community Eligibility: Making High-Poverty Schools Hunger Free (Oct. 1, 2013). <https://www.cbpp.org/research/community-eligibility-making-high-poverty-schools-hunger-free>.

²⁶ Almond, Douglas, Hilary W. Hoynes, and Diane Whitmore Schanzenbach. (2011). The Review of Economics and Statistics, MIT Press, 93(2), 387-403, December; East, Chole N. (2016). The Effect of Food Stamps on Children's Health: Evidence from Immigrants' Changing Eligibility. Denver, CO: The University of Denver. Retrieved from <http://www.sole-iolc.org/17153.pdf>; H.W. Hoynes, D.W. Schanzenbach, and D. Almond. (2016). Long-Run Impacts of Childhood Access to the Safety Net. American Economic Review, 106(4), 903-34.; Bailey, Martha, Hilary Hoynes, Maya Rossin-Slater, and Reed Walker. (Forthcoming). Evaluating the Long-Term Economic Benefits of Food Stamps.

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
Evidence: Research has revealed that SNAP has a profound impact on children's health and well-being throughout their lifespan. ²⁷			

Early childhood

High quality early care and education benefit young children and may especially help children whose families have low incomes. The benefits include short-term improvements in children's readiness for school and their well-being, which take the form of enhanced social skills, fewer behavior problems, and improved language, reading, and math skills. Longitudinal studies demonstrate that the benefits can last into adulthood, leading the child to pursue more years of education and achieve higher earnings.²⁸ Providing subsidies to support access to ECE and support parents' employment and education is a pathway toward self-sufficiency and out of poverty.

Over the past eight years, California has made investments in paid family leave, increasing access to child care and early education, and quality improvement. Appendix C provides additional details on these investments.

The Prenatal and Early Childhood Programs subcommittee considered subsidized child care, California state preschool, Alternative Payment Program, Head Start, Early Head Start, and other relevant policies and programs in generating the recommendations in Exhibit 12. The recommendations target policies such as extending parental leave, child care subsidies, and increasing ECE quality that research suggests improve outcomes for parents and young children.

Exhibit 16. Early childhood recommendations

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
1. Extend parental leave policies	Immediate	Primary impact on children and families	Most costs would be on private employers. Direct cost to state

²⁷ Almond, Douglas, Hilary W. Hoynes, and Diane Whitmore Schanzenbach. (2011). *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, MIT Press, 93(2), 387-403, December; East, Chole N. (2016). *The Effect of Food Stamps on Children's Health: Evidence from Immigrants' Changing Eligibility*. Denver, CO: The University of Denver. Retrieved from <http://www.solc-iolc.org/17153.pdf>; H.W. Hoynes, D.W. Schanzenbach, and D. Almond. (2016). Long-Run Impacts of Childhood Access to the Safety Net. *American Economic Review*, 106(4), 903-34.; Bailey, Martha, Hilary Hoynes, Maya Rossin-Slater, and Reed Walker. (Forthcoming). *Evaluating the Long-Term Economic Benefits of Food Stamps*.

²⁸ Burchinal, Margaret, Nathan Vandergrift, Robert Pianta, and Andrew Mashburn. "Threshold Analysis of Association Between Child Care Quality and Child Outcomes for Low-Income Children in Pre-Kindergarten Programs." *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, vol. 25, issue 2, pp. 166-176, 2010; Burchinal, P., M. Zaslow, and L. Tarullo. "Quality Thresholds, Features, and Dosage in Early Care and Education: Secondary Data Analyses of Child Outcomes." (Issue Editors). *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, vol. 81, issue 2, pp. 1-128, 2016; Campbell, Frances A., Craig T. Ramey, Elizabeth Pungello, Joseph Sparling, and Shari Miller-Johnson. "Early Childhood Education: Young Adult Outcomes from the Abecedarian Project." *Applied Developmental Science*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 42-57, 2002; Schweinhart, Lawrence J., Jeanne Montie, Zongping Xiang, W. Steven Barnett, Clive R. Belfield, and Milagros Nore. "Lifetime Effects: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 40." *Monographs of the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation*, 14. Ypsilanti, MI: High Scope Educational Research Foundation, 2005; Vandell, Deborah Lowe, Jay Belsky, Margaret Burchinal, Laurence Steinberg, and Nathan Vandergrift. "Do Effects of Early Child Care Extend to Age 15 Years? Results from the NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development." *Child Development*, vol. 81, no. 3, pp. 737-756, 2010

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
		in poverty and deep poverty. Also would impact those at risk of poverty.	and local governments depends on the extent of the new leave policy.
Description: Increase wage replacement to 100 percent for low-wage workers, increase utilization of paid leave policies, and consider extending the length of job protection and paid leave to ensure low-wage working families have economic supports during their infant's earliest weeks. Evidence: Parental leave expansions are associated with increased leave-taking by both mothers and fathers, and increases in leave length are larger for college-educated or married mothers than for less-educated or single mothers. ²⁹ Paid parental leave is also associated with increases in women's employment. ³⁰			
2. Guarantee child care subsidies/access to subsidized slots	Immediate/Foundational	Children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	\$1.5 billion annually to begin with slots to children ages 0-4 in deep poverty; \$3.5 billion to provide to provide slots to children ages 0-4 in poverty.
Description: Expand existing subsidy programs to guarantee that all children 0-8 living in poverty have access to a child care/early learning subsidy or CDE contracted services. Achieve a guarantee of access for all children living in deep poverty by 2022 and all children living in poverty by 2026. Evidence: Several studies have found that child care subsidies increase employment among low-income mothers. ³¹			
3. Establish a tiered reimbursement structure to incentivize, reward and retain higher levels of workforce competencies necessary to expand access and achieve positive outcomes	Foundational	Children and families in poverty and deep poverty	\$1 billion or more annually.
Description: Establish a single tiered reimbursement structure for the subsidized child care and early learning system that is tied to provider competencies, educational attainment, and professional development to incentivize the provision of higher quality services. This structure should cover the cost of ongoing quality improvement and promote equitable access to services throughout the state. Evidence: [Need evidence]			
4. Increase ECE workforce quality	Comprehensive	Focus on children and families in poverty and deep poverty but would impact other children without regard to poverty status.	Mid to high tens of millions of dollars annually.
Description: Expand access to effective training, professional development, and coaching to sustain and expand and sustain a well-trained and fairly compensated workforce and coordinated early childhood services. Evidence: Children in poverty are more likely to be in lower quality settings than children from middle-income families when evidence has shown that they benefit the most. Increased access to higher quality programs improves children's school readiness and academic achievement. An experimental study found that up to 2 hours of in-classroom coaching per week had a large impact on observed environment quality in just six months and impacts were particularly large on the quality of interactions between the			

Deleted: provide

Deleted: subsidy

²⁹ Han, W. J., Ruhm, C., & Waldfogel, J. (2009). Parental leave policies and parents' employment and leave-taking. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management: The Journal of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management*, 28(1), 29-54.

³⁰ Ruhm, C. J. (1998). The economic consequences of parental leave mandates: Lessons from Europe. *The quarterly journal of economics*, 113(1), 285-317.

³¹ Blau, D., and E. Tekin. "The Determinants and Consequences of Child Care Subsidy Receipt by Low-Income Families." Joint Center for Poverty Research Working Paper 213." Cambridge, MA: Joint Center for Poverty Research, 2001; Schaefer, S.A., J.L. Kreader, and A.M. Collins. "Parent Employment and the Use of Child Care Subsidies: Literature Review." 2006. Available at <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/8725/pdf>; Johnson-Staub, C., and H. Matthews. "CCDBG: A Critical Support for Working Families." Washington, DC: CLASP, 2017. Available at www.clasp.org/resources-and-publications/publication-1/CCDBG-A-Critical-Support.pdf

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
adults and children. ³² Another impact evaluation focused on the Program for Infant/Toddler Caregivers, which was an intensive 18-month professional development and coaching intervention for teachers of infants and toddlers in centers and home-based child care settings. Results revealed no impacts 6 and 24 months after random assignment, either on program quality or on children's outcomes. ³³			
5. Integrate and improve data systems	Comprehensive	Children and families in poverty and deep poverty	Low millions for initial planning and coordination. Potentially large future IT costs.
Description: Integrate and improve the ability to link and navigate between early childhood and other data systems to track and evaluate outcomes for children participating in subsidized child care and early learning opportunities, strengthen services to individual children and cohorts, as well as track the reach and impact of programs, starting with establishing a unique identifier for children before school entry. Use the data systems to support continuous quality improvement and to link children living in deep poverty and poverty with comprehensive services (for example, developmental screenings, early intervention, home visiting).			
Evidence: Need evidence			

Education, workforce, and training

Promoting parent's stable employment and living wage is a primary path for families to exit poverty. By improving the educational and skill attainment of parents in poverty and deep poverty, and connecting them to jobs and careers in sectors with local labor market demand, policies and programs in the workforce and training domain aim to reduce poverty for children.

Over the past eight years, California's investment in education, workforce, and training include enacting the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF); fostering "demand-driven skills attainment" by aligning workforce and education programs with the needs of state industry; and aligning, coordinating, and integrating programs and services to economize limited resources to achieve scale and impact. Appendix C provides additional details on these investments.

The Workforce, Education, and Training subcommittee was tasked with investigating numerous existing programs and policies, including career one stops, Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), CalJOBS, Community College training, college preparation, access and funding, unemployment insurance, minimum wage, career and technical education, subsidized employment, hiring credits, Work Opportunity Tax Credits, and Workers Comp. In addition, the subcommittee considered policies within the K-12 education domain, including Title 1, LCFF, school lunch, expanded learning programs, and summer school enrichment programs. In Exhibit 13, the priority recommendations focus on funding supportive services for workforce participants, increasing the supplement for low-income children in the LCFF, and increasing coordination across the many programs aiming to support education and employment

³² Boller, K., D. Paulsell, P. Del Grosso, R. Blair, D.Z. Kassow, R. Kim, and A. Raikes. "Impacts of a Child Care Quality Rating and Improvement System Focused on Coaching on Child Care Quality." *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, vol. 30, part B, pp. 306-315, 2015; Aikens, Nikki, and Lauren Akers. "Background Review of Existing Literature on Coaching." Report submitted to First 5 LA. Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, July 2011; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. "Transforming the Financing of Early Care and Education." Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2018. Available at <https://doi.org/10.17226/24984>

³³ Weinstock, P., J. Bos, F. Tseng, E. Rosenthal, L. Ortiz, C. Dowsett, et al. "Evaluation of Program for Infant/Toddler Care (PITC): An On-site Training of Caregivers." NCEE 2012- 4003. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, 2012.

for this population. Some recommendations have some promise but no existing evidence base, while others are based on results from rigorous evaluations.

Exhibit 17. Education, workforce, and training recommendations

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
1. Fund supportive services	Immediate	Primarily adults and families in deep poverty.	\$50 million per 10,000 served. Based on a cap of \$5,000 in supportive services per person.
<p>Description: Provide a dedicated source of state funds for supportive services for workforce and education program participants to ensure participants can complete programs.</p> <p>Evidence: There is no rigorous evidence, but these services are consistent with findings about common reasons for not completing programs. For example, in unpublished findings associated with the WIA evaluation, the lack of child care or affordable transportation were the primary reasons many individuals did not complete their vocational training programs.</p>			
2. Increase the investment/supplement/per pupil spending on low-income children in the Local Control Funding Formula. This must be paired with expected outcomes for educational institutions to improve the educational attainment of low-income children	Immediate	Children/families in poverty and deep poverty.	Each 1 percentage point increase in the LCFF supplemental rate raises annual costs by \$200 million. Each 1 percentage point increase in the LCFF concentration grant raises annual costs by \$60 million.
<p>Description: Increase the investment/supplement/per pupil spending on low-income children in the Local Control Funding Formula. This must be paired with expected outcomes for educational institutions to improve the educational attainment of low-income children, eliminate achievement gaps and barriers to regular school attendance (e.g., transportation, medical and/or mental health services, socioemotional support services), provide full-day opportunities (e.g., expanded learning and extracurricular activities), strengthen family engagement, and leverage community resources. Greater accountability and monitoring by the California Department of Education is needed to ensure that additional funding for low-income children actually benefits low-income children and results in increased or improved services for them as opposed to schoolwide or districtwide expenditures that are not based on a clear consideration of the needs, conditions, or circumstances of low-income children.</p> <p>Evidence: In two studies, researchers found that sustained funding increases substantially improved student academic achievement, especially for low-income school districts. In neither study were the funding increases tied to specific outcomes like family engagement, full-day schooling, and leveraging community resources, though those intermediate outcomes are independently linked with higher academic achievement.³⁴</p>			
3. Increase coordination across state and local workforce and training programs	Foundational	Primarily adults and families in deep poverty.	Initial costs of \$1-\$3 million for planning and scoping. Potentially large future costs for IT, depending on the results of the planning and scoping.
<p>Description: Strengthen connectivity and coordination of workforce and training programs at the local and state level; for example, provide funding to support coordination of services for populations with barriers to employment, such as homeless individuals and families. Require shared responsibility for outcomes to ensure that programs affecting relevant individuals learn to work outside of operational silos and programmatic funding streams.</p> <p>Evidence: No rigorous evaluation of which we are aware has attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of coordination of these programs, though it is often cited (anecdotally and in qualitative analyses) as a challenge for effective and efficient workforce programs. Indeed, each new version of the federal workforce program inches closer toward integrating disparate systems but there remains opportunity for faster progress.</p>			
4. Prioritize parents living in poverty in workforce and training programs	Comprehensive	Children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	Up to \$600 million to fully replace federal fund reductions. (\$5,000 to \$15,000 per person served – approximately 100,000 currently served).

³⁴ Jackson, Kirabo, Rucker Johnson, and Claudia Persico. 2016. "The Effects of School Spending on Education and Economic Outcomes: Evidence from School Finance Reforms." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 131(1), pp. 157-218; LaFortune, Julien, Jesse Rothstein, and Diane Whitmore Schanzenbach. 2018. "School Finance Reform and the Distribution of Student Achievement." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, vol. 10(2), pp. 1-26.

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
Description: Establish a new priority of service requirement to ensure workforce and training programs are prioritizing parents living in poverty without displacing current participants. Dedicate state funding to offset the long-term decline in federal funding of these programs. Evidence: Evidence for sector-based programs—providing both training and placement services designed to prepare participants for jobs in sectors with local labor market demand—is thinner but more promising than the mixed evidence for traditional vocational programs. Research suggests sectoral programs can lead to increased earnings and employment in high-quality jobs with better career potential. ³⁵			
5. Create career pipeline opportunities for youth	Comprehensive	Youth/young adults in poverty and deep poverty	\$125 million per 10,000 served (\$10,000 to 15,000 per person served).
Description: Increase pre-apprenticeship, apprenticeship, and summer employment opportunities for youth in poverty and create a source of dedicated funding for “earn and learn” activities targeted for individuals and families with barriers to employment. Evidence: There is strong evidence that such programs improve labor market outcomes for years beyond program participation. For example, Reed et al. (2012) found that registered apprenticeship programs increased employment rates by over 8 percentage points and earnings by about \$6,000 annually when they examined participants six and nine years after enrollment. ³⁶ Similarly, Kemple and Willner (2008) found that career academies that combined youth vocational training with job-shadowing, on-the-job-training, internships, and career guidance had persistent earnings impacts five to eight years after program participation. ³⁷			
6. Increase access to occupational licenses and credentials	Comprehensive	Children, families, and adults in poverty and deep poverty.	Modest administrative costs.
Description: Ensure all California residents in poverty have a greater ability to participate in the workforce by requiring the entities responsible for licensing and credentialing various occupations (i.e. Commission on Teacher Credentialing, Emergency Medical Services Authority, etc.) to fully implement their authorization to use an individual tax identification number in lieu of a social security number. Evidence: [Need evidence]			

Special populations

Youth in poverty who are involved in the foster care, child welfare, and juvenile justice systems have specific needs and challenges. Many struggle to secure stable housing, finish education, and get support for mental health issues. Youth of color continue to be involved in the both the juvenile justice system and foster care system at disproportionate rates. California has made some progress in investments targeting these groups over the past eight years, including

³⁵ Schaberg, Kelsey. 2017. “Can Sector Strategies Promote Longer-Term Effects? Three-Year Impacts from the WorkAdvance Demonstration.” New York, NY: MDRC; Maguire, Sheila, Joshua Freely, Carol Clymer, Maureen Conway, and Deena Schwartz. 2010. “Tuning In to Local Labor Markets: Findings from the Sectoral Employment Impact Study.” Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures; Card, David, Jochen Kluve, and Andrea Weber. 2018. “What Works? A Meta Analysis of Recent Active Labor Market Program Evaluations,” Journal of the European Economic Association, Vol 16(3), pp. 894-931; Heinrich, Carolyn. 2016. “Workforce Development in the United States: Changing Public and Private Roles and Program Effectiveness.” Manuscript prepared for Labor Activation in a Time of High Unemployment: Encouraging Work while Preserving the Social Safety-Net, forthcoming from Oxford University Press; McConnell, Sheena, Kenneth Fortson, Dana Rotz, Peter Schochet, Paul Burkander, Linda Rosenberg, Annalisa Matri, and Ronald D’Amico. 2016. “Providing Public Workforce Services to Job Seekers: 15-Month Impact Findings on the WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker Programs.” Report prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor. Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research.

³⁶ Reed, Deborah, Albert Liu, Rebecca Kleinman, Annalisa Matri, Davin Reed, Samina Sattar, and Jessica Ziegler. 2012. “An effectiveness assessment and cost-benefit analysis of Registered Apprenticeship in 10 states.” Report prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor. Oakland, CA: Mathematica Policy Research.

³⁷ Kemple, James and Cynthia Willner. 2008. “Career Academies: Long-term impacts on labor market outcomes, educational attainment, and transitions to adulthood.” New York, NY: MDRC.

policies and programs related to child care and early education (see Appendix C for more details on these investments).

The Special Populations subcommittee considered programs and policies for youth in foster care, child welfare, or the juvenile justice system. The recommendations in Exhibit 14 seek to extend childcare and other benefits to foster families, ease transitions for youth out of foster care and/or the juvenile justice system, and lessen the collateral consequences of justice system contact for youth and their families. The subcommittee also recognized that several other populations—including girls, youth involved in human trafficking, dual status youth who are in contact with both the juvenile justice and child welfare systems, youth with mental health conditions, and noncitizen youth—have specific needs that are also not being met.

Exhibit 18. Special populations recommendations

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
1. Waive outstanding juvenile court fees and fines	Immediate	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty but would impact others without regard to poverty status.	Likely net one-time costs to local governments in low millions of dollars.
<p>Description: Youth living in poverty who have been involved in the criminal justice system—whether through arrest or incarceration—are often burdened with extensive fines and fees. Pass an addendum to SB 190, which limited juvenile fees going forward, that waives or forgives outstanding debt related to these fees for juveniles living in poverty.</p> <p>Evidence: Research shows that juvenile fees are extremely harmful to families, frequently implemented unlawfully, and costly for counties to administer.³⁸ SB 190, passed in October 2017, repealed county authority to charge fees to parents for their children's interactions with the juvenile justice system, including administrative fees for children's detention, legal representation, probation supervision, electronic monitoring, and drug testing in the juvenile justice system. However many families in California still have fines and fees issued prior to the passage of the new law.</p> <p>Reference similar policy Los Angeles County and other counties have adopted</p>			
2. Create stronger statutory safeguards to protect low-income children and families from being referred to the juvenile court, prosecuted, and fined for truancy.	Immediate	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty but would impact others without regard to poverty status.	No state costs. Unknown impact on local governments.
<p>Description: Strengthen existing duties to identify and address the root causes of school attendance issues through school, district, and School Attendance Review Board (SARB) level interventions prior to, and as a pre-requisite for, juvenile court intervention. Clarify that responses to truancy should be non-punitive and promote the student's success at school while referrals to alternative education programs and/or the courts for truancy should be actions of last resort.</p> <p>Evidence: [TBD]</p>			
3. Expand the Emergency Child Care Bridge	Foundational	Children in poverty and deep poverty.	\$85 million to expand to eligible children ages 0-12; \$45 million for children 0-3.
<p>Description: Expand the Emergency Child Care Bridge ("Bridge") for foster families, which is a state-funded, county-administered child care voucher or payment that helps caregivers access temporary child care, until they can find longer-term accommodations. Eligible families can receive a time-limited voucher or payment for foster children birth through age 12, children with exceptional needs, and severely disabled children up to age 21.</p> <p>Evidence: Several studies demonstrate that early supportive, responsive relationships prevent and reverse the effects of abuse and neglect and participation in the foster care system.³⁹</p>			

Deleted: 2

³⁸ Kaplan, Alexander, Ahmed Lavalais, Tim Kline, Jenna Le, Rachel Draznin-Nagy, Ingrid Rodriguez, Jenny van der Heyde, Stephanie Campos-Bui, and Jeffrey Selbin. (2016.) High Pain, No Gain: How Juvenile Administrative Fees Harm Low-Income Families in Alameda County, California. Available at <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2738710>.

³⁹ Center on the Developing Child. (2007.) The Impact of Early Adversity on Child Development (In Brief). Retrieved from <https://developingchild.harvard.edu/resources/inbrief-the-impact-of-early-adversity-on-childrens-development/>.

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
4. Provide adequate and appropriate housing	Foundational	Youth in poverty and deep poverty.	Providing additional 4,000 THP-Plus housing slots would cost approximately \$160 million annually.
<p>Description: Provide adequate and appropriate housing for Transition Age Youth (TAY) and non-minor dependents (NMD). Housing instability and homelessness significantly hinder foster youths' pursuit of higher education, meaningful employment, and self-sufficiency. The child welfare system is one of the main pipelines into homelessness. To stem the flow of foster youth into homelessness, invest in long-term housing stability for this population.</p> <p>Evidence: TAY and NMD are at significant risk of chronic homelessness, decreased educational and employment outcomes, increased likelihood of poverty and increased likelihood of interaction with the justice system if they are not supported as they transition from childhood to adulthood and strive to achieve self-sufficiency.</p>			
5. Examine strategies and opportunities to increase contact visiting between children and their parents at local jails that give children the opportunity to touch and hug their parents.	Immediate	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty but would impact others without regard to poverty status.	TBD
<p>Description: Ensure that family issues are assessed and addressed during jail or prison intake and during reentry planning processes throughout a parent's involvement in the criminal justice system.</p> <p>Evidence: [Need evidence]</p>			
6. School stability for foster youth, by ensuring reimbursements to caregivers to transport the youth to school of origin.	Foundational	Children in poverty and deep poverty.	About \$13.5 million annually.
<p>Description: TBD</p> <p>Evidence: [Need evidence]</p>			
7. Fully fund the Youth Reinvestment	Comprehensive	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	About \$60 million per year.
<p>Description: Fully fund the Youth Reinvestment program to support diversion programming that can reduce unnecessary youth contact with the juvenile justice system.</p> <p>Evidence: Several studies support the benefits and outcomes of diversion programs. A meta-analysis of pre-charge diversion programs for youth found that programs providing just a caution (with no referral to services) and programs providing an intervention are both more effective than the traditional justice system in reducing recidivism; however, a second meta-analysis found no difference in the outcomes of diverted youth and traditionally processed youth.⁴⁰ For youth on probation, therapeutic interventions can be more effective at preventing repeat offenses than punishment-based approaches are, and therapy is often incorporated into probation supervision practices or used as an alternative to incarceration.⁴¹</p>			
8. Facilitate post-secondary education for justice involved and foster youth	Comprehensive	Primarily young adults in poverty and deep poverty.	\$11.5 million annually.
<p>Description: Provide all students who have obtained their high school diploma or equivalent while detained with the option of enrolling in a college course and/or a CTE program. Eventually, this policy could expand to provide dual-enrollment and college counseling/financial aid counseling to those youth not yet eligible to enroll full-time in post-secondary schools.</p> <p>Evidence: There are several successful examples of such programs, including Project Change at the College of San Mateo County, CA and Oregon Youth Authority's post-secondary education programming for all OYA facilities. [CITATION]</p>			
9. Enhance transition support for justice-involved youth	Comprehensive	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	Administrative and support costs, potentially in low millions of dollars.

Deleted: 3

Deleted: 4

Deleted: TBD

Deleted: 5

Deleted: 6

Deleted: 7

Deleted: 8

⁴⁰ Wilson, H. A., & Hoge, R. D. (2013). The effect of youth diversion programs on recidivism: A meta-analytic review. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 40(5), 497-518.; Schwalbe, C. S., Gearing, R. E., MacKenzie, M. J., Brewer, K. B., & Ibrahim, R. (2012). A meta-analysis of experimental studies of diversion programs for juvenile offenders. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 32(1), 26-33.

⁴¹ Lipsey, M. W. (2009). The primary factors that characterize effective interventions with juvenile offenders: A meta-analytic overview. *Victims and Offenders*, 4(2), 124-147.

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
Description: Current state laws do not assign responsibility of students' re-entry transitions to a singular agency due to the nature of multi-agency collaboration that is required for re-entry. Currently, only County Offices of Education and County Probation Departments are mandated parties for joint transition plans. School districts and the County agency dedicated to labor or workforce should also be required parties. Evidence: [Need evidence]			
10. Improve juvenile justice data systems	Comprehensive	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	Low millions to develop cost plan. Potentially large future IT costs.
Description: California's largely local juvenile justice system is supported by poor statewide data infrastructure and inconsistent data collection and reporting practices, which inhibit the state's ability to make data-driven decisions about reforms. Fully fund recommendations made by the California Juvenile Justice Data Working Group in 2016 to replace the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS), consolidate state-level data collection in one agency, expand range of outcome data collected, and establish a web-based statewide juvenile justice data clearinghouse. Evidence: The California Juvenile Justice Data Working Group's report, Rebuilding California's Juvenile Justice Data System: Recommendations to Improve Data Collection, Performance Measures and Outcomes for California Youth, makes the case for improving these data systems. ⁴²			
11. Create and expand Kinship Navigator programs	Comprehensive	Children in deep poverty.	\$6 million over next 3-4 years.
Description: Create and expand Kinship Navigator programs Evidence: [Need evidence]			
12. Improve data collection practices to identify children with incarcerated parents.	TBD	TBD	TBD
Description: Recommend that the state legislature mandate and fund data collection practices at local and county jails and intake and service planning assessments for all child and youth-based service delivery systems to better capture the number of children that are impacted by adult incarceration. The goal would be to then use that data to drive increased resources and better practices within local governments to address the needs of children with an incarcerated parent. Evidence: [Need evidence]			
13. Create funding streams to support preventive and treatment services for those children most impacted by incarceration.	TBD	TBD	TBD
Description: TBD Evidence: [Need evidence]			
14. Implement a statewide pilot project to create additional Regional CCIPs (Children of Incarcerated Parents Partnerships).	TBD	TBD	TBD
Description: This project would identify additional regions in the state with a large number of children with incarcerated parents and build CCIPs that are funded by State and County resources so that there is dedicated funding to staff and support coordination of regional coalitions. The key purpose is to promote the Children of Incarcerated Parents Bill of Rights (https://www.sfcipp.org/blank). Evidence: [Need evidence]			
15. Promote placement stability for foster and homeless youth.	TBD	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty, as well as children who are not in poverty. There are approximately 60,000 children in foster care in California.	Estimated first-year costs of \$15 million to establish the statewide hotline and implement mobile response services. Estimated ongoing annual total costs of \$30 million to maintain the system. Costs of \$159,000 in FY 2018-19 and \$225,000 in FY 2019-20 and ongoing for two additional positions.

Deleted: 9

Deleted: 0

Deleted: 1

Deleted: 2

Deleted: 3

Deleted: 4

⁴² California Juvenile Justice Data Working Group. (2016.) Rebuilding California's Juvenile Justice Data Systems: Recommendations to Improve Data Collection, Performance Measures and Outcomes for California Youth. Report to the Legislature. Retrieved from <http://www.bscc.ca.gov/downloads/JJDWG%20Report%20FINAL%2011-16.pdf>.

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
Description: Promoting placement stability for foster and homeless youth. Require county child welfare, probation, and behavioral health agencies to establish county-based Family Urgent Response Systems for the provision of mobile crisis-response services to current or former foster youth and their caregivers, and require CDSS to establish a statewide hotline, to be available 24 hours per day, seven days per week to respond to caregiver or youth calls when a crisis arises			
Evidence: Need evidence			

Coordinated services

Families in poverty have an array of service needs and linking families with these support services can be challenging because of disparate eligibility rules, staff who understand just their own program, and families' lack of time to learn about, find, and apply for services they need and are eligible for. Coordinated services programs aim to combine services for parents and their children to support parent economic security, supportive parenting, and children's healthy development. By focusing on the immediate risks facing these families (such as medical conditions and income instability) and simultaneously providing parenting education or access to high quality early childhood education, coordinated services programs seek to move families out of poverty in the short-term and decrease the chance that poverty will continue into the next generation. These broad and sustained services are a response to the evidence on brief, narrowly focused programs, which have shown only modest and short-term effects.

Over the past eight years, California has invested resources in areas such as home visitation and data sharing and integration in an effort to coordinate service delivery. Appendix C provides additional details on these investments.

The Coordinated Services subcommittee considered how services provided throughout the taskforce domains can be combined and coordinated. Examples of programs and policies the subcommittee considered are two-generation programs, home visiting programs, Promise Neighborhoods/Promise Zones, and community schools. In Exhibit 15, the priority recommendations include streamlining applications for public assistance to more efficiently enroll families in the multiple services and programs they may qualify for at one time, expanding home visiting programs, and creating new Promise Neighborhoods throughout the state.

Exhibit 19. Coordinated services recommendations

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
1. Create a single application for public assistance	Immediate	Children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	Low millions for development and coordination. Unknown, potentially major IT costs to facilitate integration.

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
<p>Description: Institute a “no wrong door”, single application for eligibility of public assistance (including housing, child care, CalWORKs, CalFresh, Medi-Cal, Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), school meals, and more). This streamlined single point of entry to access public benefits could become a national model for states to more efficiently enroll families in benefits. This policy also builds on AB2960⁴³ that was just signed into law by the Governor, and which creates a single portal for childcare and development programs, including program and eligibility information, the opportunity to connect with resource and referral agencies and providers, the ability to use an online eligibility screening tool in order to assess eligibility for services, a way to link to local child care resource and referral agencies and alternative payment programs for additional assistance in selecting and assessing child care, and access to placement on waiting lists for local subsidized child care programs. <u>Technology should be utilized to expand outreach regarding availability of these services. As part of development and implementation, access issues must be addressed including language access and the lack of access to computer based applications and information portals for families in poverty and deep poverty.</u></p> <p>Evidence: The largest social safety net programs kept an estimated 7.8% of Californians out of poverty in 2016.</p> <p>These programs include CalFresh, CalWORKs, the federal EITC and state CalEITC, the Child Tax Credit (CTC), Supplemental Security Income (SSI/SSP), General Assistance (GA), federal housing subsidies, WIC, and school meals. CalFresh and the combined EITCs lowered the poverty rate most, by 2.1 and 2.0 percentage points, respectively. CalWORKs lowered the rate by 1.0 point.⁴⁴</p>			
2. Expand voluntary home visiting	Immediate	Children with families in <u>poverty and deep poverty</u> .	Additional state funding starting at about \$300 million per year, scaling up over time. Full costs would eventually exceed \$2 billion annually. However, net additional state costs would depend on ability to draw on federal Medi-Cal and TANF surplus funds.
<p>Description: Expand voluntary evidence-based home visiting for <u>low-income</u> families who are expecting a new baby and/or parenting a child under two years of age.⁴⁵</p> <p>Evidence: Research shows that home visiting improves cognitive and social development, family safety, parenting, mental health, health behaviors and outcomes, and decreases reliance on public assistance.⁴⁵</p>			
3. Create 20 new Promise Neighborhoods throughout California	Foundational	Focus on children and families in poverty and deep poverty but would have positive impacts on other children and families in the designated neighborhoods, without regard to poverty status.	\$100 million annually, assuming \$5 million per promise neighborhood.

Deleted: living in deep poverty

Deleted: Unmet need and proposed scale/phase – ability to offer services 50%, increase percentage over time.

⁴³ CA AB2960 | 2017-2018 | Regular Session. (2018, September 27). LegiScan. Retrieved October 08, 2018, from <https://legiscan.com/CA/bill/AB2960/2017>.

⁴⁴ Bohn, Sarah, Caroline Danielson, and Tess Thorman. (2018). Poverty in California. San Francisco, CA: Public Policy Institute of California. Retrieved from: http://www.ppic.org/wp-content/uploads/JTF_PovertyJTF.pdf

⁴⁵ First 5 LA. (n.d). Research Shows Home Visiting Works. Retrieved from <http://homevisitingla.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/LACPECHVC-First5LA-BOS-LABBN-Home-Visiting-One-Pager.pdf>.

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
<p>Description: A Promise Neighborhood uses a place-based approach to saturate the target community with cradle-through-college-and-career solutions, including early childhood education, K-12 academic support, college and career readiness, and family supportive services. Promise Neighborhoods tailor their specific set of cradle-to-college-and-career solutions to the local context, but each share the following characteristics: results-driven focus on impacting population-level results; place-based to focus on a specific high need geography; collective impact is achieved through partnerships; the model is community-powered to address local needs and build on local strengths; it relies on both public and private investments and aligns funding streams to achieve shared outcomes; the model is equity-focused and explicit in addressing disparities by race, ethnicity, gender, income, immigration status, or other factors; and most importantly, Promise Neighborhoods implement a comprehensive cradle-to-college-and-career continuum that addresses all of a family's needs to help them move out of poverty.</p> <p>Evidence: Evidence from five federally funded Promise Neighborhoods in California (collectively called the CA Promise Neighborhood Network) demonstrates the effectiveness of the model. For example, LA Promise Neighborhood high schools have more than doubled the percent of students who graduate "college ready" (meeting the requirements for UC/CSU admissions) – from 31% in 2013 up to 68% in 2017. [Need citation]</p>			
4. Integrate state agency services	Comprehensive	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty, but also would impact those at risk of poverty but not in poverty.	Low millions for planning and development costs. Potentially major IT costs in future.
<p>Description: Integrate services of the main state agencies that have most responsibility for reducing child poverty by developing a MOU. The multi-agency MOU could both create new programs, as well as leverage existing state programs/funding. This may include giving preference on funding opportunities to designated Promise Neighborhoods or other high-poverty geographies, offering technical assistance, or convening communities of practice on specific topics.</p> <p>Evidence: In 2016, 16 federal agencies signed a shared MOU to collaborate and direct resources toward federally designated Promise Zone communities. This has led to increased federal investments in these high-need, high-poverty communities, demonstrating the effectiveness of this proposed policy in directing resources to address childhood poverty. For example, the Los Angeles Promise Zone has secured over \$314 million in federal funds from over a dozen different agencies to support efforts aimed at reducing poverty. [Need citation]</p>			
5. Pass legislation to ease data sharing among education, human services, public safety, and health organizations	Foundational	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty, but also would impact those at risk of poverty but not in poverty.	Low millions for planning and development costs. Potentially significant IT costs.
<p>Description: Enact legislation to facilitate and ease data sharing among state and local agencies. This may be modeled on efforts such as the Silicon Valley Data Trust, which is a three county effort to develop a shared data system that includes school districts, juvenile justice, case management entities, mental health, public health, and social services. State and local agencies included in the data sharing agreement would each export their individual-level data into the shared system to be aggregated across all partnering agencies, providing a more holistic view of individual and family needs. For example, a shared data system could flag risk factors across data sources. For a youth in the juvenile justice system, the system could look at their academic level to determine whether they should be placed back in school or find an alternative education option, while also flagging any mental health issues that need to be addressed for that individual.</p> <p>Evidence: Powered by Data compiled a series of case studies that illustrate the benefits, risks, and conditions for successful data sharing in the social service sector.⁴⁶</p>			

⁴⁶ Powered by Data. (2018.) Maximizing Impact through Administrative Data Sharing. Retrieved from <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5623f0e8e4b0126254053337/t/5b2039890e2c72c2ed5fa1a0/1528838538348/Pu-blic+Briefing+Document+-+Admin+Data+-+June+12+2018+-+Updated.pdf>.

Healthcare

[Narrative]

[Past investments]

Exhibit 20. Healthcare recommendations

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
1. Expand Medi-Cal coverage	Immediate	Children and families in poverty and deep poverty, as well as those at risk of poverty.	\$2.4 billion annually. \$1.5 billion annually if new eligibility is limited to undocumented adults with dependent children with incomes less than 138% of FPL.
Description: Expand Medi-Cal coverage to all adults with dependent children, up to 200% federal poverty level (FPL) regardless of immigration status. Evidence: [Need evidence]			
2. Provide funding streams to open clinics in high poverty areas	Immediate	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	Initial one-time funding of \$100 million.
Description: Develop a state funding mechanism through the California Health Facilities Financing Authority (similar to “Cedillo-Alarcon capital grant program”), to fund nonprofit federally qualified health centers to expand clinic sites into underserved and high poverty areas (including building school-based health centers). Evidence: [Need evidence]			
3. Develop early intervention and primary prevention programs	Comprehensive	Children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	Initially \$100 million annually, potentially expanding over time to low- to mid- hundreds of millions of dollars, depending on number of low-income families served and scope of services.
Description: In alignment with Medi-Cal and other health programs, develop and fund comprehensive primary prevention programs (including dental and behavioral health) that deliver children’s health services outside of a clinic, namely, elementary, middle and high school campuses and state and federally-sponsored child care and early learning programs, settings, to reimburse nonprofit healthcare providers for primary prevention and early health intervention services provided on these sites outside of a clinic. Evidence: [Need evidence]			
4. Reimburse care coordination	Comprehensive	Children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	Initially \$100 million annually, potentially expanding over time to low- to mid- hundreds of millions of dollars, depending on number of low-income families served and scope of services.
Description: Pursue policies and develop funding streams to reimburse health providers to provide care coordination, case management, health education services and social supports for low-income families with children. Evidence: [Need evidence]			

Deleted: D

Deleted: early intervention and

Deleted: ,

Deleted: ,

Deleted: focused on

Deleted: funded

Deleted: D

Deleted: nonprofit

Deleted: and

Deleted: to provide social support and engage the social determinants of health